

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-24, 26-54, and 57-60 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 are amended in this paper. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-24, 26-27, 34-54 and 57-60 Under 35 USC 103(a)

As Obvious Over Kaminski In View of Phillips and Abbey

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites a front-end circuit operable to receive a plurality of radio signals, transmitted across a frequency band and operable to generate an analog signal simultaneously carrying a plurality of channels within said frequency band; an analog to digital converter operable to convert said analog signal to a digital signal simultaneously carrying said plurality of channels within said frequency band; and a digital processing system operable to receive said digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within said frequency band.

In contrast, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, particularly as they pertain to a digital processing system operable to receive a digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within a frequency band.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's allegations, it seems clear to Applicant's attorney that the Abbey reference fails to teach or suggest a digital processing system operable to receive a digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within a frequency band. For example, col. 4, lines 39-40, cited by the Examiner in support of her position, states that "[s]ystem 10, in the example configurations, can support up to four simultaneous, independent users

communicating in different modes and on different bands.” Referring to Figures 3 and 4, also cited by the Examiner as supporting her position, it further seems clear that the parallel processors 78 each receive a corresponding respective signal in order to generate a single respective corresponding output. As such, Abbey teaches multiple input signals required to simultaneously output corresponding multiple output signals, rather than generating a plurality of output signals from a single digital input signal.

Claims 18, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57

Claims 18, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57 are patentable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-9, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 26-27, 35-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 58-60

Claims 2-9, 11-16, 19, 21-24, 26-27, 35-42, 44-45, 47-52, 54 and 58-60 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53 and 57.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-8, 11-16, 34-36, 38 and 43 Under 35 USC 102(e) or 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski

Claim 1

As is the case with the Lehman reference, Kaminski fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, particularly as they pertain to aviation-specific modulation formats and functionality.

Claims 34 and 43

Claims 34 and 43 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 5-8, 11-16, 35-36, and 38

Claims 5-8, 11-16, 35-36, and 38 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1, 34, and 43.

Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski In View of Phillips, Abbey and Luneau

Luneau fails to supply the teachings missing from the other cited references, particularly as they pertain to a digital processing system operable to receive a digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within a frequency band. As such the prior art references, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 18. Additionally, and consequently, claim 28 is patentable for at least the reason that it depends from claim 18.

Rejection of Claims 29-33 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski In View of Phillips, Abbey and Luneau

Luneau fails to supply the teachings missing from the other cited references, particularly as they pertain to a digital processing system operable to receive a digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within a frequency band. As such the prior art references, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 29. Additionally, and consequently, claims 30-33 are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from claim 29.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the examiner has any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^PLLC

/P.G. Scott Born/

P.G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491